REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of June 16, 2006, Applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment and the following remarks. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 11, 16, and 22 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 16, 21, 22, and 23 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at, for example, page 6, line 27 to page 7, line 2 and FIG. 2 of the application.

Claim Objections

Claims 9 and 10 have been objected to for informalities. In response, Applicant has amended claim 10 to address the Examiner's concerns. The amendment to claim 1 is believed to address the Examiner's concerns regarding claim 9.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 11-19, 22, and 24

Claims 1-3, 7-8, 11-19, 22, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,151,631 to Ansell et al. ("Ansell") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,687 to Gehani et al. ("Gehani"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Ansell and Gehani, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 11, 16, and 22. For example, with respect to claim 1, neither Ansell nor Gehani describe or suggest "determining a geographic location of the terminal server based on the terminal server identifier" and "querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server."

In greater detail, claim 1 recites a method for transferring data between a host system, a database, and a terminal server. At a host system, a terminal server identifier is received from a terminal server, a geographic location of the terminal server is determined based on the terminal server identifier. A database is queried to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server, and the geographic location specific service data is automatically

sent from the host system to the terminal server in response to a client connecting to the terminal server.

As indicated by the abstract, Ansell relates to techniques for delivering digital products to client computers through a wide area network only upon a determination that the client computer is located in a geopolitical territory for which delivery of the digital product is authorized. A server computer 150 conditionally sends a digital product to a client computer 160 depending on the geographical location of the client computer. See Ansell at col. 5, lines 3-5. In particular, using the network address of the client computer 160, a territorial restriction server 100 determines the geopolitical territory within which the client computer 160 is located. See Ansell at col. 5, lines 8-11.

Thus, Ansell determines a geopolitical location of a client computer that requests digital content from a server prior to sending a digital product to the client computer. Stated differently, Ansell's techniques suggest conditioning whether or not the server computer will communicate with the requesting client computer on geopolitical territory in which the requesting client computer is located. Thus, Ansell contrasts with the claims, which indicate that a database is queried to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server and that the service data is automatically sent from the host system to the terminal server.

Moreover, as Ansell determines whether or not to communicate a digital product to the client computer at all depending on the client computer's geopolitical location, Ansell teaches away from a method that identifies and automatically sends geographic location specific service data, such as the method recited by claim 1. Thus, Ansell does not describe or suggest querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server, as recited by claim 1. Additionally, as Ansell's techniques determine the geopolitical location in which the requesting client computer is located, Ansell also does not describe or suggest determining a geographic location of a terminal server based on the terminal server identifier, also as recited by claim 1.

Gehani relates to a "geo-enabled" personal information manager that allows a user to access geographic information appropriate to an address, or other location identifier, of a

personal contact. See Gehani at col. 1, lines 61-65 and col. 3, lines 17-18. The personal information manager stores contact information such as names, addresses, and telephone numbers. See Gehani at Abstract. A geographic information server uses the location identifier to retrieve geographic information that is appropriate to the location corresponding to the location identifier of the personal contact. See Gehani at Abstract. Thus, Gehani allows a user to obtain geographic information that relates to the location of a personal contact. As such, Gehani also does not describe or suggest querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server, as recited by claim 1. Moreover, Gehani also does not describe or suggest determining a geographic location of the terminal server based on the terminal server identifier, also as recited by claim 1.

Consequently, neither Ansell nor Gehani, nor any proper combination of these references, describes or suggests determining a geographic location of a terminal server based on a terminal server identifier and querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server based on the terminal server identifier, as recited by claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal or the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10.

Dependent claims 4-6, 9-10, 20-21, and 23

Dependent claims 4-6, 9-10, 20-21, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ansell and Gehani in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026349 to Reilly et al. ("Reilly"). However, Reilly does not remedy the failure of Ansell and Gehani to describe or suggest querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server, as recited by claim 1. Moreover, Reilly does not describe or suggest determining the geographical location of a terminal server based on the terminal server identifier, also as recited by claim 1. Nor does the Office Action assert that Reilly does so. Rather, the Office Action relies on Reilly for "establishing a data connection between the terminal server and a client computer." See Office Action of June 16, 2006 at page 9, lines 6-7.

Reilly relates to an information and advertising distribution system. See Reilly at Abstract. An information editor 130 is used to select and edit news stories for dissemination to subscriber's computers. See Reilly at para. 0033. The selecting and editing is typically done by a person using a user interface 116 running on an information server 104. See Reilly at para. 0033. Reilly's system allows subscribers to specify the type of information they receive through a "category profiler" that stores the subscriber's preferences in a "category profile data structure" 202B. See Reilly at para. 0051. Thus, Reilly's system distributes data according to the preferences set by the subscribers rather than according to the geographic location of a terminal server that a subscriber is connected to. Notably, like Ansell and Gehani, Reilly also does not describe or suggest determining a geographic location of a terminal server based on a terminal server identifier and querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server, as recited by claim 1, from which claim 4 depends.

As such, neither Ansell, Gehani, Reilly, or any proper combination of these references describes or suggests determining a geographic location of a terminal server based on a terminal server identifier and querying a database to identify service data associated with the geographic location of the terminal server, as recited by claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10.

Independent claims 11, 16, and 22 recite features similar to those recited by claim 1. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal or the rejection of independent claims 11, 16, and 22 as well as their respective dependent claims, 12-15, 17-21, 23, and 24.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to

concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, Applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the Office Action dated June 16, 2006, be extended for three months to and including December 18, 2006. Applicant notes that December 16, 2006 occurred on a Saturday.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee ($1020.00) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/18/2006

W. Karl Renner
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40384472.doc